S.F.T.S
LIBRARY

The REFORMED JOURNAL

4 — No. 8 A Periodical of Reformed Comment and Opinion September, 1954

WATERINK WAS HERE

THE Rev. Dr. Jan Waterink, ofessor of Psychology and Peda-gics at the Free University of Am-rdam, was Guest Professor at Cal-College and Seminary during the ond semester of the academic year -53-54.

It was through the good offices of Calvin Foundation that he came re. The Foundation is an independ-t organization of Reformed Christians erested in the development and prop-ation of Calvinist thought and learn-g. It has no official connection with e school. Its founder and benefactor Mr. William B. Eerdmans, Sr., whose eat generosity has enabled the direc-s to execute the large and fruitful ojects the Foundation has undertaken. e Directors represent every part of e Christian Reformed Church. Since e Foundation is primarily interested the advancement of Christian schol-ship the Presidents of Calvin College d Seminary, the Chairman of the rators, the President of the Calvin umni Association, and two members the college and seminary teaching affs are by constitutional provisions ovided a seat on its Board. Repre-ntative men from various sections of e country round out its membership.

Two years ago the Foundation spon-red a lecture tour by Professor G. C. erkouwer, the distinguished Dutch gmatician. The success of that tour, e learning and geniality of our guest, d the strength and fruitfulness of the ond he helped lay between the Re-rmed communities of The Netherlands d America predisposed the Board to look again to Holland when it contemplated its next venture.

When it looked, its eye soon fell on Professor Waterink, and an invitation was issued to him — an invitation not, this time, to lecture throughout the country (although he was eminently qualified to do so), but to teach at the College and the Seminary and to perform auxiliary services in the Grand Rapids area. With the hearty consent of the Curators he was invited to take up residence on the campus and to stay for an entire semester. He accepted the Board's invitation and arrived in Grand Rapids in mid-January of this year, accompanied by his wife and sister. Except for a short visit to the East and a more extended one to the West Coast, he stayed in Michigan during the whole of six months, bound there by a most strenuous program of teaching, lecturing, and counselling. At the end he served his church as a fraternal delegate to the Synod of the Christian Reformed Church in June.

Now he is in Amsterdam, having sailed with his family in August from the port of New York. He is back home, but traces of his presence are to be seen all over this area. His influence lives on. It is evident on every hand that Waterink was here.

* * *

HE left a mark on the students. In the College he taught psychology and in the Seminary he taught a course in Pastoral Counselling. The students in both places heard him gladly. They appreciated his learning, his experience, his judgment, his disciplined good sense. So also did the ministers of this area. Interrupting their accustomed schedule of work they came in large numbers to attend his classes in the Seminary.

The school teachers profited from his

IN THIS ISSUE

Waterink Was Here ..... *Henry Stob* 1
The Unity of the Church ..... *John Weidenaar* 3
It Couldn't Happen There ..... *George Stob* 6
Thoughts for Teachers ..... *Henry Zylstra* 8
The French Worker-Priests ..... *Harry R. Boer* 10
Koene Vanden Bosch ..... *J. G. Vanden Bosch* 13
Love and Discrimination ..... *James Daane* 15

Waterink Was Here — Continued

presence too. In a series of lectures on Pedagogics, held in the evening for teachers and board members, Professor Waterink defined Christian perspectives in educational theory and practice. These lectures, attractively put out by the Eerdmans Publishing Company, are now available in the book stores. They constitute a substantial contribution to a Christian science of education, and they will, I am sure, affect our discussions of educational questions for a long time to come.

The faculty met Waterink often — in the school halls, over coffee in the Commons, at home in the evening — but also at regularly scheduled semi-formal Seminars where all the members of the staff gathered to discuss questions of common interest. In these discussions Professor Waterink took a leading part, for it was his duty to introduce the topic of the evening. The topics were chosen with a view to increasing our understanding both of ourselves and of our brothers across the sea. Issues philosophical and doctrinal were analyzed and clarified. Note was taken not only of our common commitments but also of the tensions that sometimes appear on the surface of our ecclesiastical life and by their presence disturb our poise and effectiveness. Attention was given to ways of removing or reducing these tensions without stifling the impulse to creative thought and reducing everything to monotonous uniformity. Comparisons were made, too, of the Dutch and American situations in so far as they affected the nature and extent of the Reformed witness within each country. Differences in our histories, orientations, and emphases were observed and assessed in the light of our shared convictions. Through it all we came to know each other better, and the communities which we serve, and a new strong link was forged in the chain that binds us to those of like faith with ourselves in the land of our fathers.

I shall not speak at length of Professor Waterink's further labors and engagements. He preached often, he delivered numerous public lectures before church and civic groups, he was frequently called upon to give advice in psychiatric cases, he counselled many who came to him with business, personal, or academic problems. He was a very busy man. I fear we taxed his uncertain health to its very limits.

WHEN Waterink left we were sorry to see him go. We had come to admire and respect him. We admired his unusual powers of observation, his ready apprehension, his charity of judgment, the absence in him of all pedantry and affectation, his great capacity for friendship, his deep and infectuous piety, the wholesomeness of his theological outlook. When he left he had become the friend of all of us. In the space of seven short months he had carved for himself a lasting place in our affections and esteem. The same holds, *mutatis mutandi*, for Mrs. Waterink and Mrs. Schouten. They endeared themselves to all who met them. We are glad they came, and now that they have returned we assure them that they have not been forgotten.

* * *

THE traffic on the road between America and The Netherlands is heavy these days. This is all to the good. We need to meet each other. There may sometimes be a collision on the way, but it need not be fatal to anyone, and it must not stop the traffic. In a day when men everywhere are seeking out their brothers in the faith we must not fail to find our own. These are found all over — in America, in Scotland, in England, in Hungary, in South Africa, in Holland. We are not yet sure how we can best approach them ecclesiastically. Neither the World Council nor the ICC seems at present to be the designated vehicle. The Reformed Ecumenical Synod, on the other hand, which is the vehicle we have chosen, is still young and weak and largely ineffectual. While it grows, and while we prayerfully consider our further ecumenical responsibilities, there is one thing we can do: meet regularly as individuals and groups with those of our brothers who are within reach. Of these our brothers in The Netherlands stand without doubt closer to us than any other. Between us there should be constant and extended intercourse.

We are glad that an increasing number of our students go to Amsterdam to supplement their education, and that our ministers occasionally go abroad for conferences and discussions. We are glad that we were able to invite Berkouwer and Waterink over here for extended visits. This must continue. Other men must come from there, and some of ours must go from here. The traffic should keep flowing from both sides, and on all levels. In this way we can combine our strengths while compensating for our weaknesses, and through it all, with God's blessing, advance the cause of Calvinism in the world.

HENRY STOB

THE REFORMED JOURNAL

VOLUME IV NO. 8

SEPTEMBER, 1954

A Periodical of Reformed Comment and Opinion

EDITORIAL BOARD

Rev. Harry R. Boer, Dr. James Daane, Rev. George Stob, Dr. Henry Stob, Dr. Henry Zylstra

Published each month by the Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Subscription price: $2.00 per year

Entered as Second Class Matter at the Postoffice at Grand Rapids, Mich.

Address all subscriptions and communications to:

THE REFORMED JOURNAL

255 Jefferson Avenue, S. E.

Grand Rapids 3, Mich.

"For a teacher to tell a Bible-story without having the Bible before her, as sometimes happens, is psychologically wrong. The children, the little ones included, should not have the feeling that the teacher 'is simply telling a nice story.' Already at a very early age the children should know at least that the Bible is the source of our knowledge concerning the work of God for our salvation. And as soon as they are able, the children must themselves make use of the Bible. They should be required to read the Bible and to make use of it. They should have to read the Bible at school, but also at home. And at church they should follow the Scripture reading as well as the reading of the text in their own Bibles. In this way we bring the Bible to the child and the child to the Bible."

—WATERINK, *Pedagogy*

The Unity of the Church

by JOHN WEIDENAAR*

An Exposition of Phil. 2:1-11

JESUS prayed for the unity of the urch. He said: "And the glory ich thou hast given me I have given o them; that they may be one, even we are one; I in them and thou in , that they may be perfected into ; *that the world may know* that thou lst send me and lovedst them even as u lovedst me" (John 17:22, 23). on another occasion Jesus declared: very kingdom divided against itself brought to desolation, and every city house divided against itself shall not nd" (Matthew 12:25). How greatly ul was concerned about the lack of ity in the Church and how deeply was stirred by divisions in the urch appears from his first epistle the church at Corinth. There were isions in that church. Some said, I of Paul; others, I am of Apollos; hird group, I am of Cephas, while ers dared to arrogate to themselves distinction of being of Christ while posing the rest. It was precisely this itude that Paul scored when he desig- ted it *the wisdom of this world.* He sed his discussion of this danger to Church with the solemn words: "If y man destroyeth the temple of God, n shall God destroy; for the temple God is holy and such are ye" (I Cor. 17). The unity of the Church is of preme importance and value. It is condition for its growth within and testimony without. It is the glory the Church and its witness to the rld.

In Philippians 2:1-11 Paul speaks of unity of the Church and says three ngs about it. First, he indicates its ndamental basis; next, he outlines its actical expression; and finally, he esents its inspiring example.

The Fundamental Basis

DURING the last World War the ited States and Russia were drawn gether. They were drawn together cause they had a common foe. But soon as the foe was vanquished, the ity based only on a common foe was ssipated. The previously existing differences which lay dormant during the conflict reasserted themselves and came to the fore after the battle was won. The unity based on a common conflict did not endure. Postwar conditions have demonstrated the inadequacy of that provisional unity between Russia and the United States.

Paul and his Philippian friends were drawn together because they had a common foe and a common conflict, but Paul was well aware of the fact that there had to be a firmer basis and a more solid foundation for abiding unity. That is another way of saying that we cannot build the unity of the Church on the foundation of the antithesis. The antithesis is real and genuine but it is not going to endure. God has made known to us the mystery of his will that it is his good pleasure which he purposed in Christ to sum up all things in Christ (Eph. 1). For this reason and in the interest of the true unity of the Church Paul indicates in the opening lines of Philippians 2 the fundamental, the essential bases of the unity of the Church.

* * *

THE basis is fourfold. First, there is the exhortation in Christ. The unity of the Church centers in the Christ. We confess "that the Son of God, out of the whole human race, from the beginning to the end of the world, gathers, defends, and preserves for Himself, by his Spirit and Word, in the unity of the true faith, a Church chosen to everlasting life; and that I am, and forever shall remain, a living member thereof (Heidelberg Catechism, Lord's Day XXI, 54)." The unity of the Church is not merely ideological, however powerful that may be; it is not only idealistic, however inspiring that may be. The unity of the Church certainly involves doctrinal soundness and ethical purity, but it is more than that. The unity of the Church is concerned with the truth, but it is bigger than that too. The essential ingredient of the unity of the Church is a matter of being IN CHRIST. It involves an intimate relation to and a personal commitment to the Christ. It is, if anything, *personal.* Ideas and ideals have the power to move men only when these ideas are embodied in and only when these ideals are incarnated in the person of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ!

But Paul will not allow this relation to the Christ to remain undefined. Much less will he permit its commitment to evaporate in an unspecified emotional attachment. It is an *exhortation* in Christ. That means just one thing and that one thing is OBEDIENCE to the Christ. The form in which Paul casts it makes clear that this is a whole-souled and loving obedience to the Christ. Nothing less will do. The test of that love is as Jesus said elsewhere, obedience, for, "If you love me, you will keep my commandments."

The keeping of the commandments of Jesus becomes imperative when differences arise among believers. Differences arise because no two believers are identical and because no believer on earth is without sin. Differences among believers are to be tolerated but may never lead to divisions among them. That is the barrier which may not be crossed. Paul wrote of this in Phil. 3:15 when he declared that mature Christians who differ at the same time cherish the hope that God will reveal the truth in course of time. In the meantime such believers will keep on walking together on the basis of their fundamental agreements. It should also be remembered that there is an area of thought and conduct on which Christians may differ to such a degree that what the one adjudges to be wrong the other holds to be right. There is a territory of individual liberty upon which no other Christian may dare to trespass. Paul elaborates on this matter of Christian liberty in Romans 14 and 15. Obviously there is and must be unanimity among believers on the basic issues such as the Trinity, the deity of the Christ, the personality of the Holy Spirit, the infallibility of the Word of God, and those truths which have obtained classic expression in the confessions of the Church to which the believer voluntarily subscribes, and which, if the need arise, he vigorously defends. But all believers bow humbly and gratefully in loving obedience to the Christ. In their obedience to the ordinances and commandments of the Lord they find their basic unity.

Rev. Weidenaar is Associate Professor of ble at Calvin College.

The Unity of the Church — Continued

BECAUSE believers are related to the Christ they are bound together in the consolation or, better, in the persuasion of love which makes for unity. It is the persuasion of love that moves believers in "giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body and one Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body and one Spirit, even as also ye were called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is over all and through all and in all" (Eph. 4:3-6). The persuasion of love means simply this: that I am persuaded and act on the persuasion that my brother and sister are indeed my brother and my sister. Read the opening chapters of the epistles of Paul and observe that Paul addresses the entire Church as saints, beloved of God, the faithful in Christ Jesus, faithful brethren, and so on. God has chosen a people unto himself, not an aggregate of individuals here and there among whom I must carefully discriminate before I accept them as true-blue believers. I am not acting in accord with the persuasion of love if I presume to entertain suspicions respecting my fellow-member, by virtue of which I mentally exclude him from the Church of Christ.

But someone will say, There are hypocrites in the Church; there are tares among the wheat, and Paul wrote that they are not all Israel that are of Israel. Since hypocrites do righteous *acts* (giving of alms, praying, fasting, etc.) in front of men, to be seen of men, for the praise of men, it is manifestly impossible to discern them. When the servants of the householder offered to gather up the tares, he forbade them "lest haply while ye gather up the tares, ye root up the wheat with them." At the end of the world in the harvest time the angels which the Son of Man will send forth will purge the tares and burn them with fire. As for the rest who do become manifest, there is such a thing as a divinely revealed Church Order which indicates precisely what the Church in its official capacity is called upon to do when there are good grounds for believing that persons err in doctrine or in life.

And it is especially at the point that fellow-members err in doctrine or in life that the operation of the persuasion of love is called for. If a fellow-member proclaims manifest heresy or engages in un-Christian practices, whether that be public or private, I must still maintain the persuasion of love with respect to that person. To do anything short of that is to expose myself to the judgment of one who acts faithlessly towards the Christ and lovelessly to the brother. I must obey the ordinances of the Christ. I must observe the requirements of the Christian faith and of the Church Order. I may not set myself up, individually or with a group, apart from official and divinely revealed procedures, to attack such a person. To say that the truth must prevail, that publicity is permitted, that petitions may be sent forth, — all this is to resort to the wisdom of this world which is miles removed from the obedience to the Christ. Read in this connection Matthew 18, — all of it, — and ask yourself whether there is ever any occasion which warrants departure from the mandate of the Christ first to "go, show him his fault between thee and him alone." And when we do so, let us be sure that our doing is in the persuasion of love.

* * *

A third factor basic to the unity of the Church is the fellowship of the Spirit. A common calamity or foe can make people huddle together and will even lead them to work together for a time. Racial unity, national loyalty, family ties and blood can hold people together for a long time but the one bond that unites them inwardly and eternally is the unity of the Spirit. I am referring of course not to the human spirit, but to the Holy Spirit. By virtue of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit the spirits of believers are fused into an unbreakable unity which even death cannot sever. The essential mark of the Christian is his possession of the Spirit of Christ who is the Holy Spirit. Christians should remember that this Spirit is the Holy One. That will determine the level on which this fellowship ought to move them. Sometimes Christians forget of what Spirit they really are. Oftentimes they begin with the Spirit and end up with the flesh. It was James the idealistic realist who taught us that pure religion and undefiled before our God and Father is to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction and that in doing so we must keep ourselves unspotted from the world. Christians must see to it that their relation does not descend to the level of carnality as was the case at Corinth.

* * *

THE fourth thing that Paul mentions is tender mercies and compassions. It is simply impossible for Christians to get along with each other without the exercise of mercy and compassion. It is an essential mark of a child of God that he show mercy and compassion. Were it not for the mercy and compassion of our Heavenly Father, we should never have become children of God. If we are unable to forgive others their trespasses we thereby show that our own trespasses have not yet been forgiven. Jesus said, "Blessed are the merciful for they shall obtain mercy." Who knows how soon the day will come when we shall be desperately in need of the tender mercies and compassions of others! In the great epistle of Paul to the Ephesians which possibly more than any other stresses the unity of the Church, Paul warned against the things that tear Christians apart and indicated the proper attitude when he wrote: "And grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, in whom ye were sealed unto the day of redemption. Let all bitterness and wrath and anger and clamor and railing be put away from you with all malice; and be ye kind one to another, tenderhearted, forgiving each other, even as God also in Christ forgave you." To promote and preserve the unity of the Church, I must do four things: I must obey the Christ, love the brotherhood, have fellowship in the Spirit, and show mercy and compassion.

The Practical Expression

THE result of obedience to the Christ, love for the brotherhood, fellowship in the Spirit, and tender mercies and compassions will be the fulfilment of Paul's joy. Paul did not hesitate to take advantage of the Philippians' love for him in seeking to advance the unity of the Church. At the same time his primary object was not his own happiness or enjoyment, but the unity of the Church. That is why he added that their obedience would make them to be of the same mind, of the same love, of one accord and of one mind. He piles up words to underscore the importance of unity in the Church.

nd in order to implement his exhortaon, he tells them exactly what they ight to do and what they ought not do.

* * *

Christians should do nothing through iction. A faction is a futile effort to cialize selfishness. Whenever any art, any group, within the Church raws itself apart from the total comunity, sets itself apart, and arrogates itself the prerogative of seeking to nprove the Church, to correct the evils, d to oppose the ones it adjudges to heretical and delinquent, no matter ith how high sounding a name it signates itself, — that group is a ction. The banding together of a rious-minded group of persons who scern evils and dangers within the urch and are determined to do someing about it by means of organizaon and periodicals — that is the foration of a faction. This is the creaon of an *ecclesiola in ecclesia.* Paul as keenly aware of this danger when warned the Philippians against doing anything through a faction. In omans 16 he wrote pertinently: "Now beseech you, brethren, mark them that e causing the divisions and occasions stumbling, contrary to the doctrine hich ye learned; and turn away from em. For they that are such serve not ur Lord Christ but their own belly; nd by their smooth and fair speech ey beguile the hearts of the innoent. For your obedience is come broad unto all men. I rejoice therere over you; but I would have you ise unto that which is good and simple nto that which is evil. And the God f peace shall bruise Satan under your eet shortly."

These people are wise after a fashion ecause they resort to smooth and fair peech and thereby beguile even the nnocent. Their fundamental error is hat they are disobedient to the Lord hrist. They have devised their own ay of "improving the Church." They efuse to obey the plainly revealed ordiances of the Christ and therefore they orget the importance of the persuasion f love. As a result they disturb the ellowship in the Spirit and in the name f militancy deny tender mercies and ompassions. They believe in unofficial ublic censure, become informers, disurb the peace of the Church, and act s though Matthew 18 were not in the Bible. They seek to defend the *faith* f the Church by trampling underfoot he divinely revealed ordinances respecting the *order* of the Church. The individual manifestation of factionalism is vainglory!

Now all of us are exposed to this evil of forming factions because we are not what we ought to be, because we are apt to succumb to the wisdom of the world, because we are interested in the purity of the Church, and because we do not want to stand alone. It is a danger which brings out the worst of us in the best among us. It is therefore highly imperative that we know how to counter this tendency which has repeatedly wrought havoc in the Church of God. We cannot deal with this ever present and highly insidious evil by a mere prohibition; we must resort to the principle of substitution. This is the way out: Let each of us in lowliness of mind count the other better than himself! Let each of us not look to his own things but also to the things of others!

* * *

SINCE the essential individual characteristic of factionalism is vainglory we need not be surprised that Paul admonishes us to be lowly in mind, to be humble. That is the polar opposite of vainglory and pride. I must count my brother to be better than myself! Think on that! The man, the woman who is sitting next to me I am to esteem higher than myself; that is the deathblow for selfishness. I must make an end to making myself number one. I should look to the things of others. I must get rid of this eternal and infernal preoccupation with myself. As I look within I am horrified to discover how much of my effort is centered on self. I want to get ahead, I want to be somebody, I seek the praise of men, I am filled with projects and schemes to further my selfish ambitions. If I were doomed to live forever with myself and for myself, I should be of all men the most miserable! No wonder solitary confinement is such a horrible punishment. Each day anew I need to wage the battle against self and pride. And as I listen to Paul, I despair of ever living up to the high demands of the Word of God. I say: Paul, that is impossible; that demands nothing short of a stupendous miracle. And Paul would reply: True indeed; that does require a miracle, the miracle of the grace of God! But if you are a Christian you are a miracle of God's grace. Every Christian is a miraculous person. And Paul would go on to say: It is right for me to be thus minded on behalf of you because I have you in my heart and I am confident of this very thing, that he who began a good work in you will perfect it until the day of Jesus Christ (cf. Phil. 1:6, 7). What an amazing, stupendous, and glorious ideal the Word of God confronts us with! No wonder that men said of Paul and his associates that they were turning the world upside down! It takes nothing less than the atomic blast of God to make sinners dead in trespasses alive unto God; and it requires nothing short of the dynamic explosion of the gospel to make saved sinners become saved saints! Wasn't it Jonathan Edwards who wrote on *The Expulsive Power of a New Affection?*

The Inspiring Example

PAUL knew by revelation and then from personal experience the measure and the price of being humble, the *sine qua non* for the unity of the Church. There was a time when he had confidence in the flesh, when he was self-confident, and when he boasted in his prerogatives and doted on his own achievements. Flushed with unholy zeal and breathing out cruelty, with the angelic face of Stephen goading and torturing him, he sallied forth on the road to Damascus to conquer and to forget. But he did not conquer and he never forgot. *Si Stephanus non orasset ecclesia Paulum non haberet.* But it took more than the dying Stephen to remake Paul; it was the living Jesus who had arisen and ascended who appeared to Paul as the Living God. The light from heaven blinded him but it was the voice of Jesus that broke his heart, changed his mind, and transformed his life. And what a transformation! But let Paul tell us: "Howbeit what things were gain to me, these have I counted loss for Christ. Yea verily, and I count all things to be loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord; for whom I suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but refuse, that I may gain Christ, . . . that I may know him and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, becoming conformed unto his death; if by any means I may attain unto the resurrection from the dead!"

Paul knew the price of self-denial; he had counted the cost. If Paul wavered even for a moment and wondered for a second whether the Philippian friends could and would respond to his

The Unity of the Church — Continued

exhortation, his doubts were soon dispelled. Paul might fail and falter for a while but the Christ would never fail. For in the same moment there arose before Paul's startled gaze the figure of the Christ of the cross. And then he wrote these golden words: "Have this mind in you which was also in Christ Jesus, who, existing in the form of God, counted not the being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross."

Language breaks down in the contemplation of this revelation. Christ Jesus existing in the form of God was God, is God and forever will remain God. The Son of God *emptied* himself because he did not count the being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped. While remaining God he took on the form of a servant and became flesh. He humbled himself even unto the death of the cross! This is nothing short of the *humility of God!* God humbled himself. Who is there among mortal men who dares to entertain the thought of the humility of God? God dared it because there was no other way to redeem and restore you and me. We speak of the humiliation of the Christ but do we know what we are saying? Have we even made a beginning in the discovery of the holy rashness of the Word of God? Elsewhere Paul spoke of the weakness of God and the foolishness of God and here we have the amazing humility of God! In the face of this inspiring example there is nothing to be said but this:

When I survey the wondrous cross
on which the Prince of Glory died,
My richest gain I count but loss
and pour contempt on all my pride.
Forbid it, Lord, that I should boast,
save in the death of Christ, my God!
All the vain things that charm me most,
I sacrifice them through his blood.

But Paul could not stop there. He went on and we go with him as he wrote: "Wherefore also God highly exalted him and gave unto him a name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow . . . and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." Knowing the humility of God, can you dare to be proud? The unity of the Church, which Jesus loves and for which he died, can only be promoted and preserved by those who walk in humility. Are you humble? Would you like to be? Then, look to Jesus! Obey him in matters of faith *and order;* love the brotherhood; maintain the fellowship in the Spirit; and be sure to manifest tender mercies and compassion. There is no other way.

It Couldn't Happen There

by GEORGE STOB

JASON was a man of means — a merchant who resided in the city of Thessalonica, in Greece.

One of the dispersed of the Lord's children, he was a devout Jew who had been reared in the faith of his fathers. When the Apostle Paul came to Thessalonica on his second missionary journey and proclaimed as Christ the Jesus who suffered, died, and rose again, Jason was one of those who entered into the fullness of the ancient faith. He became a Christian.

Jason was a relative of Paul. Like his great kinsman he showed himself willing to suffer for the sake of the Lord Jesus. He took a leading part in the life of the Church which Paul had founded at Thessalonica. Indeed, as the foremost elder, he was a pillar in that Church, and he was known and beloved for his faith and service not only in Macedonia and Achaia, but in every place.

Jason had occasion once to make the long voyage to Rome. It was sometime since he had visited the capital of the empire. The prospect of going again, of seeing the pomp and splendor of the city, and of visiting again with friends and relatives there, thrilled him.

He was the more thrilled now because he knew the gospel had come to Rome also. His own kinsmen had become followers of the Way, and had received Jesus as the Christ. How wonderful it would be to fellowship again with his beloved brother Herodion, — a brother more precious because now a brother in Christ. And how wonderful it would be to visit the Church of Rome, known throughout the world for its warm hospitality, and to worship in the Word and commune in the Holy Supper with the saints in Christ who were at Rome.

* * *

THE voyage was a pleasant one. On the voyage and at ports along the way Jason had met fellow-Christians from Ephesus, Miletus, Corinth, Jerusalem, Antioch, and other places. They were Greeks, Romans, Syrians, Ethiopians, as well as Jews; and Jason was impressed with the marvel of the grace in Christ which had united people of different races and nationalities, and from areas widespread, into one holy communion.

There were others, too, — philosophers, rhetoricians, merchants, who professed another faith, and with whom Jason conversed and disputed. And there were some of his own flesh and blood who were so violently hostile to the Christian faith that Jason thought they must be of the synagogue of Satan rather than of the synagogue of God. The meeting with such as these the more deeply touched him with a sense of the beauty of fellowship with those who were of like precious faith with him.

In due course Jason came to Rome and hastened to the home of his brother Herodion. Words cannot tell what joy it was for these two to be in each other's company again, or what treasured moments Jason spent with his brother's family and in the home which showed in every part the beauty and the grace of Christ. And Jason considered what pleasure would be his when he came into the bosom of the family of saints in the Church of Rome.

* * *

JASON was speaking with his brother Herodion about this on Saturday night.

"Indeed, Herodion, we are, as Paul s said, one bread, one body, even ough we are many — for we all par- ke of the one bread, even Jesus Christ. id now, on the morrow, I from Thes- lonica, and perhaps others from other aces, will be united with you at Rome the communion of the body and ood of our Lord."

Herodion shifted a bit uneasily. He swered: "To be sure, Jason, to be re. Tomorrow thou mayest meet th us at the table of the Lord. Thou lt, of course, come with me to the uncil meeting, and obtain permis- on."

Jason looked questioningly at his other, then smiled his gentle smile d said: "It seemeth a bit strange, erodion. I know how thou hast arned toward me in the mercies of arist. And I know, too, how those o are in Christ yearn toward those o are one body in Him. And yet, nen I speak of communing with thee d thy fellows in the body and blood Christ, thou seemest fearful of invit- g me to come with thee. Thou say- t only that I 'may,' and *that* only after have obtained 'permission' from the eeting of the Council."

"Ah, yes, forgive me, my brother," id Herodion. "But thou knowest how is. We have these Church rules. For may chance that some will come who e defiled with games and shows, and erchance some who are under disci- ine in their own churches. We must ard the table, thou knowest, lest it e profaned by those unworthy. And is by this means that we screen, or, s some say, fence the table."

Jason smiled gently again. "'Tis true, erodion. We should not cast what is oly to the dogs. The Lord's Supper not like a barbecue at a public fair – open to all who might come. We ust, indeed, guard the table, although sometimes wonder how we shall be ble to discern and bar the hypocrites, – for example, the presbyter who steals nd lies in business but is otherwise so trictly pious. But, let that be. I hould suppose, however, that there ould be little cause for guarding the able against me. I hope I am not verly proud. But thou knowest me ell, brother Herodion. Wilt thou not ay to thy brother presbyters that thy wn brother has come to thee and wish- s to commune with thee and them in he body of Christ?"

"Ah, Jason," said Herodion, in turn, at another time I might have done so. Such was, indeed, our former manner. But we have now come to follow another practice. And now, I cannot ask for thee. Thou must come thyself to the Council before the service begins, and ask for thyself."

"Is it so?" asked Jason. "But why? Have thy own presbyters sometimes made improper requests for profane people? Have many violations of the holy table occurred? Has the mesh of the screen been too large, or the staves of the fence too wide apart? Has the Supper been much defiled, so that these more rigorous measures have been introduced?"

"I cannot say so," answered Herodion. "There has been no specific occasion for the change of practice. It is just part of the Church's concern for the refinement of her own rules and practice, I suppose. Perhaps it gives the Church a better conscience to know that she is really quite diligent about keeping close communion really close. In any event, the practice has become quite widespread. Many churches now follow the same practice. And for the sake of uniformity, formal certificates are being used."

"Certificates!" cried Jason. "Certificates! Certificates for what? Shall I be required to give a piece of parchment to the usher, as a ticket for a seat at the Lord's table? What meanst thou, Herodion?"

"Thou dost not understand, Jason," answered Herodion. "It is not so crass a thing as thou dost suspect. And I wish thou would'st not lose thy gentle smile as I see thee now losing it. See, my brother, it is thus. If one wishes to partake of the Lord's Supper with us, we ask him to appear before the Council. In the presence of the Council he shall be asked of what Church he is a member, and whether he is a member in good standing."

"Will they ask me if I believe in the Lord Jesus, and if I cherish the blood shed for my soul, and if I long for His precious sacrament, and for communion with others in His body and blood? Will they ask me such things?" Jason asked with some feeling.

"No, perhaps not — at least, I have not heard it so. No doubt it is assumed that if one is a member in good standing all is well. At least, the Church seems then to be safeguarding the table — if she is careful to let in only those who are members in good standing. That is — but ah, do not confuse me so, my brother. I have not made the rule. But it is the rule, and thou art expected to come, answer the questions, and sign the parchment."

"Is not my word enough?" asked Jason. "And if my word were confirmed by the witness of my brother and my friends, would not that suffice? Pray tell me, why must I sign the certificate?"

"Be patient, Jason, and I will tell thee further. The brethren will certainly accept thy word. But . . . well, I don't know why thou 'rt expected to sign. But thus it is done. And when thou hast signed, the certificate will be sent by the next most convenient courier to the Church at Thessalonica. Thus thy own Church Council will know that thou hast, when absent and in the great city of Rome, partaken of the Holy Supper here."

"And thus," said Jason somewhat sharply, "the piety of the presbyter Jason will be certified to the Church at Thessalonica. They will not know what games I have frequented, what associations I have kept, nor how I have carried on my business. But they will know that in the Church of Rome I partook of the Holy Supper. They need not believe my own word that it is so — though heretofore they have been willing to trust my word. They will have a certificate, signed by me, and countersigned and sealed by the Council of the Church of Rome. Ah, it is marvelous. This is efficiency. I propose that the certificate which is employed be designated 'O.C.D.,' which, being interpreted, is: "Officially Certified Devout.'"

"But, Jason, be not so hard. We only intend — but ah, I know not what we intend. But we are concerned to be strict, and not loose like some other churches, and we want to guard the holy table. You see, this kind of practice is the mark of a good church, and we want to be a good church. We do not mean to discourage thee. We do, indeed, want thee to come. We know thee well. The signing of the certificate will be only a formality; but it is required of thee, too, that thou shouldest comply, for this is the rule."

"I will come," said Jason. "I will come, climbing over the certificate and all the barbs it puts into the fence. But the pleasure will not be so great as I had anticipated. I am not accustomed to breaking through circles of officious disciples and working through reams of red tape in order to come to the body and blood of my Lord. But I do trust

It Couldn't Happen There — Continued

that when I shall have come to Him, I shall forget that His own made hard the way to Him. And I trust that, forgiving each other as we have been forgiven, we shall all be found humble and trusting when we eat and drink His sacrifice."

* * *

BOTH Jason and Herodion were silent. After awhile Jason's gentle smile returned, and there was something added to it. There was a sly look skipping out of the corner of his eye.

Said Jason: "But now tell me, brother Herodion. How do ye call this new system or method for the fencing of the table?"

Herodion smiled, too. He answered: "We call it, quite appropriately, the Christian *Phi Beta Iota*, for it is an ecclesiastical network of investigators that searches out and keeps the record on many church members."

"Well named," observed Jason, whose smile was just as gentle, though the twinkle leaping out of the eye bordered on the mischievous. "Well named," he said, "but strangely executed. For this *Phi Beta Iota* doeth other than is ordinary. For, as it is known in our empire, the *Phi Beta Iota* searcheth out and recordeth those who are evil. But thy *Phi Beta Iota* searcheth out and recordeth not the evil, but the good."

* * *

THIS is a fable. For obviously it couldn't happen there!

Thoughts for Teachers

by HENRY ZYLSTRA

IN THESE DAYS registration is due again. We shall have to be concerned once more, both on the school and college levels, to see that our students get a solid core of liberal studies. There will be that tremendous pull towards the practical. The Commercial Course will seem to make so much more sense than the Classical Course. Somehow, in practice, Carlyle's old definition of man as a tool-using animal appeals to us just as much as Calvin's idea of a God-knowing creature. It is an old tension, this one between the practical and the liberal arts. I quote from the younger Seneca as Macaulay quoted him in his essay on Bacon:

> In my time there have been inventions of this sort, transparent windows, tubes for diffusing warmth equally through all parts of a building, shorthand, which has been carried to such a perfection that a writer can keep pace with the most rapid speaker. But the invention of such things is drudgery for the lowest slaves; philosophy lies deeper. It is not her office to teach men how to use their hands. The object of her lessons is to form the soul.

The object is to form the soul. That will be a good phrase to have in mind as we sit at the registration tables arranging the schedules of our pupils. Which shall it be now, Latin or Gregg? The object is to form the soul.

Two hundred years after Seneca old Plotinus gave out his idea of the relative value of liberal and vocational training:

> For who that is strong enough to meditate upon the original turns by choice to its phantasm? Witness the circumstances that among children it is the dunces who betake themselves to the crafts and manual employments, because they are not competent to learning and meditation.

That is by now a quaint way to put it: "who that is strong enough to meditate upon the original turns . . . to its phantasm." But this is to say that the thing is no substitute for the idea, and that there is a difference between the servile and the liberal arts.

* * *

WE have been using the word *integration* a lot in our discussions of education. It is a great word and no doubt we shall have to use it some more. Personally, I like the word *orientation*. It may be that we have spoiled it a little with our university Orientation Week and the like. Such a week is devoted primarily to helping the student find himself on the campus. But even the meaning of that is not bad for getting at what education is. For once I shall quote the dictionary to help establish a point. To orient, says Webster, *means to cause to face toward the east.* It means *to ascertain the bearings of a thing.* How much more important those bearings are for us teachers than the thing itself. We have to get squared around towards God if the universe is to make sense. Life is bewildering and meaningless without the fixed reference point. And how were one to find his way in a life of eternity with a map of time except he have a polar point, a Bethlehem, an Incarnation? Orientation: that is our work as teachers. We must give our pupils their bearings in life by causing them to face towards the east.

* * *

Arthur Koestler, in his novel *Arrival and Departure* (Macmillan, 1943) powerfully illustrates how a differing assumption or dogma changes the picture of reality. The facts we look at in our schools are very much the same as those that are studied in other schools. But the patterns we see — and life like a painting, is a muddle until we discern the pattern — are different. Koestler says:

> As children we used to be given a curious kind of puzzle to play with. It was a paper with a tangle of very thin blue and red lines. If you just looked at it you couldn't make out anything. But if you covered it with a piece of transparent red tissue-paper, the red lines of the drawing disappeared and the blue lines formed a picture — it was a clown in a circus holding a hoop and a little dog jumping through it. And if you covered the same drawing with blue tissue-paper, a roaring lion appeared, chasing the clown across the ring. You can do the same thing with every mortal, living or dead. You can look at him through tissue-paper and write a biography of Napoleon in terms of his pituitary gland, as has been done; the fact that he incidentally

conquered Europe will appear as a mere symptom of the activities of those two tiny lobes, the size of a pea. You can explain the message of the Prophets as epileptical foam and the Sistine Madonna as the projection of an incestuous dream. . . . The clown and the lion are both there, interwoven in the same pattern. . . . Since the Renaissance the red tissue-paper of our scientific reasoning has obtained greater perfection than the blue of our intuition and ethical beliefs. . . . But prior to that, in the Gothic age, the scales moved the opposite way; and I believe that this process will soon be reversed again.

f you just looked at it you couldn't ake out anything." This, then, is the cessity of dogma in education, ounded in the religious nature of an. There is no possibility of finding eself in the universe, of getting one's arings, of being oriented, in neutral ucation. After that the question bemes, Through the tissue paper of *hich* dogma is one reading reality?

* * *

THE point of departure for sevral of these ideas is my reading of rofessor Frederick A. Pottle's book, *ie Idiom of Poetry* (Cornell University ress, 1946). He has some good things say also about a problem which is current among us in our schools: amely, What may our students, our upils, read? On this point of Chrisan liberty in the reading of books, rofessor Pottle takes a strong stand. might well serve, it seems to me, as a atement of our own ideal in this matr. He says:

> We protect children from books that might cause trouble, as we keep certain kinds of food from them, but when they grow up they must decide by the testimony of their own livers and their own consciences. It was profoundly said by St. Augustine that all morality can be summed up in the injunction, "Love God and do what you will." The saying could as well take the form, "Love God and read what you will."

r. Pottle understands the considerable nreat to the morality of the young in ome contemporary literature, but he inks that the best way to deal with it to build up positive resources of rength:

> The church would do well to worry less about the demoralizing effect of contemporary literature and more about the sincerity, persistence, and competence of its training of the young.

* * *

Dr. Pottle is one of those modern minds who have the honesty to admit that "Every man, without exception, has his orthodoxies. . . ." There is always an area of dogma, an area of things which we take for granted. For most people of our time this uncritically accepted area is the scientific one. "Without being taught to do so," he says, we assign all 'truth' to the province of science. Whatever science cannot manipulate we feel to be unreal or untrue." But other basic assumptions lead to a different kind of quest from the modern, and to the acknowledgment of a different kind of evidence. "How could men," asks Professor Pottle, "thinking of the Middle Ages, be content to remain so ignorant of ascertainable facts?" The answer is clear:

> Because they were 'making sense' of nature in a framework (the theological) which interested them more than the scientific. . . .

The same was true of the Greeks, though their dogma differed from that of the Middle Ages as well as from that of the Modern Age:

> Is it not clear that the ancient Greeks could have made every discovery in science on which we pride ourselves, if they had thought it worthwhile?

This is perhaps our hardest work as Christian teachers and the most inescapably obligatory: namely, to discriminate dogma, to discern within which framework a particular book, or period, or author is 'making sense' of reality.

* * *

IT may be that this use which I am making of the word *dogma* in these notes is a little singular. It is not synonymous with doctrine. It leads to doctrine when it is articulated but it is not itself the doctrine. It is the faith behind the creed but it is not itself the statement of the creed. V. A. Demant used the term a good deal in his *Religious Prospect,* and my impression is that men of letters are using the term to designate a category of assumptions or 'framework within which to make sense of reality' rather more than theologians are. Anyhow, the idea is more important than the term, and the reality than the idea. I borrow some further account, therefore, of this whole matter from T. E. Hulme. Hulme explained in his *Speculations* (Harcourt, Brace, 1936) that in order to get at a period or an age one must get at its dogma:

> In order to understand a period it is necessary not so much to be acquainted with its more defined opinions as with the doctrines which are thought of not as doctrines, but as FACTS. There are certain doctrines which for a particular period seem not doctrines, but inevitable categories of the human mind. Men do not look to them merely as correct opinion, for they have become so much a part of the mind, and lie so far back, that they are never really conscious of them at all. They do not see them, but see other things through them. . . . It is these *doctrines* felt as *facts,* which are the source of all the other more material characteristics of a period.

Once more now, I suggest that dogma in this sense, though you may call it what you will, is the thing that we must be always getting at in the classroom. People who feel that Christian school teachers do not need a thoroughgoing education do not understand this.

* * *

Another example of how differing assumptions about life make for a different reading of reality is the nice contrast between Thomas Henry Huxley's and Herman Bavinck's accounts of the physical earth and its importance. Huxley followed in Darwin's wake and argued that "general conceptions of the universe . . . have been forced upon us by physical science." Among these general conceptions which Huxley felt "forced" to adopt because of his scientific framework of making sense out of reality was the following:

> It is very certain that the earth is not the chief body in the material universe, and that the world is not subordinated to man's use.

And here is Herman Bavinck, for whom the 'theological dicta' that Huxley scorned entered into making sense of nature. Here is Bavinck, looking at the same data through the other tissue paper, as Koestler would say, of revelation (*Magnalia Dei*):

Thoughts for Teachers — Continued

> And man is and remains the crown of creation; the dressing and cultivation of the earth ministers to man's benefit. That is why Scripture says so little about the creation of the heavens and of the angels, and limits itself mainly to the earth. In an astronomical sense the earth may be small and insignificant; in mass and weight it may be surpassed by thousands of planets and suns and stars: but in a religious and moral sense the earth remains the center of the universe. It and it alone has been chosen as a dwelling place for man. It is the arena in which the great struggle against every evil power is conducted. It is the place for the establishment of the kingdom of heaven.

Except in the sense of the 8th Psalm, there apparently is no reason why, for a person governed by religious dogma, the immensities of the physical universe as demonstrated by science should diminish the significance of man. It is a kind of false modesty to think less of ourselves because the physical world is so big.

* * *

KOESTLER thought that the scientific framework by which in the modern time men have chosen to make sense of life and reality would give way again to one of "intuition and ethical belief." We teachers should be alert, I think, to this change which has been heralded by many prophets of our time, particularly by men of letters, and which does indeed seem to be already well under way. A new and different dogma, in the sense of these notes, is shaping up in the middle decades of this century. The change seems to be a change from Liberal Man and Natural Man to Religious Man. Some think of it as likely to be a bigger change than that which happened at the French Revolution, and as big a change as that which took place at the Renaissance. We seem to be moving from an age of science into an age of faith.

Perhaps, though, I should not call it an age of faith that we are entering upon. I remember being admonished against it by Wystan H. Auden, a writer who has been especially sensitive to just this shift of dogmatic climate here under discussion. He once called such a designation a misnomer. He said it in a statement which pretty well characterizes the scientific assumptions within which the modern world has heretofore elected to confine its truth. He said it in his Foreword to Emile Cammaerts' *The Flower of Grass* (Harper, New York, 1945):

> It is wrong to speak of ages of faith and ages of doubt, as if a man could ever be without either, but each has its favorite idol, and of the late age it may be said that it had a belief, approaching superstition, in the presentational immediacy, the being-thereness of a fact, and a doubt, approaching denial, of its having any further meaning or value.

But this mentality which Auden here speaks of he assigns to "the late age." The implication is that this age is no longer here. And he characterizes its successor, too, in an off-hand clause which seems to me very happily struck off, and one of the most important sentences recorded in our decade. It comes at the end of his book, *The Enchafed Flood* (Faber and Faber, London, 1951):

> We live in a new age in which . . the necessity of dogma is once more recognized, not as the contradiction of reason and feeling, but as their ground and foundation.

It may be that before century's end — and after all dates do not govern spiritual epochs — this of Auden, and its equivalent in, as I say, many other writers, will be the text to exegete in characterization of our time. Those of us, if any, who have practically as well as theoretically escaped the liberal and positivist dogma of a scientific framework of interpretation, will presumably welcome the return of an acknowledged religious dimension. For it is dogma that determines what we mean to recognize as evidence.

The return to the religious way of making sense of reality will not, of course, solve all of our problems. Being religious is not synonymous with being Christian. A whole new set of advantages and disadvantages may be ahead of us. There will be disadvantages, too: irrationalism and resurgent naturalism can come back in the guise of religious affirmation. But when the issue no longer is whether or not there is to be a faith, but rather one of which faith it is to be, we shall be more honest and direct with each other all around.

Meanwhile we teachers must be alert to the changing soul of the times.

The French Worker-Priests

by HARRY R. BOER

IT may at first glance seem somewhat strange that there should appear in this Protestant and American periodical an article about a Roman Catholic ecclesiastical situation in France. This strangeness will disappear, we believe, as the reader reads along. The problem of the French worker-priests has in it an intensely universal element arising out of the deep pathos attending a large and hopeful effort to confront the masses with the message of the Church. The development of this effort and the unhappy course which it has taken has drawn attention far across the borders of France. It is the subject of broad and competent discussion not only in the European religious, but also the daily press, Protestant, Roman Catholic and neutral. It is deserving of more attention than it has had in America. The question that meets us here is, How shall the Church reach the unchurched masses? A group of French priests has given an answer to this question. This answer initially had ecclesiastical blessing. It enjoys this blessing no longer. We shall try to set forth the outlines of this movement. What is its background? What form has it taken? What has been the ecclesiastical reaction to it? What does it mean for us?

The French Religious Situation

RELIGIOUSLY speaking, France more than any other country, may be called 'the sick man of Europe.' Of population of about forty-three millio

number variously estimated between ht and fourteen million has a great- or less degree of connection with the urch. Of this number approximately en hundred and fifty thousand are otestant, chiefly Lutheran and Re- med. The remainder are Roman tholic. The rest of the French popu- e stands wholly outside the Church manifest so small an interest in her t they must be regarded as standing tside of her. The problem of the un- urched in France is most acute in the es. A pastor in a typical laborers' tion in Paris reports that on paper has a parish of twenty-five thousand, t actually only three to four hundred these regularly make confession and end mass. Some years ago the of- e of the archbishop of Paris an- unced that 90% of the population of eater Paris is unchurched. This ans that in Paris alone some five and half million people never see the in- e of a Church. The historical roots this situation we cannot here dis- s. The expulsion of the Hugenots 1685, which robbed France of a al religious element, the French Rev- ution, particularly in its religious nificance, industrialization with its endant migration from country to y, would doubtless have to be taken o account in any analysis of causes.

There is a contemporary cause, how- er, which must be noted, since it nds at the heart of the worker-priest oblem. The Church in France bears strongly middle-class character. She nds associated in the minds of many th conservatism in political and onomic life. Rightly or wrongly, any feel that the Church has not ised her voice as she should have ainst the social and economic evils at exist. Among the foremost of ese is the great shortage of housing r the laboring man. While expensive artments are being built, thousands on thousands live in cramped and un- nitary quarters. Five hundred thou- nd people in Paris regularly live in tel rooms at high rent. In many uses there is only one lavatory for veral families. It is in a situation e this that Communism flourishes. t present about 25% of the French ectorate supports the Communist rty. A great deal of this support ubtless comes from dissatisfaction ith existing conditions rather than om the reasoned conviction that Com- unism is the answer to the country's eds. An observer relates that in 1951 he saw elderly women taking part in a Communist demonstration against re- armament. Were they so convinced that they should take part in this dem- onstration because of feelings they en- tertained about rearmament? Or were the Communist slogans and demonstra- tions against exploitation the only means open to them to protest openly against the sordid conditions in which they had to live and to see others live day by day?

The membership of the Church, by and large, seems to be more among the groups benefitted by the economic un- balance of things than among those who are exploited and victimized by it. Whether or in how far this complaint against the Church is justified we need not here discuss. The fact is that the masses are alienated from her and not a few among them believe that the Church is more to be associated with the propertied classes than with the la- boring segment of the population.

The central fact with which evangel- ism in all of western Europe must reck- on is that the masses have done with the Church. It is so in France, and it is to no small extent true in Holland, Germany, the Scandinavian countries, and in England. It is a problem that Roman Catholics and Protestants face in common today. The alienation of the masses from the Church finds its most open and unambiguous expression in France. It is also in France that the most open and unambiguous answer to the problem has been attempted. This answer is called

The Mission de Paris

ROMAN Catholic leadership in France has long been concerned about the situation sketched above. It tried one approach and another to meet the baffling indifference that confronted her. Evangelization in the usually ac- cepted sense of the word largely failed. The social distance between the Church's representatives and the labor- ing classes could not be bridged. Such converts as were gained did not feel at home in the churches. Youth work yielded no adequate results. All these efforts in their varying degrees of fail- ure preceded the worker-priest program.

A man who was deeply moved both by the spiritual indifference of the masses and by the seeming impotence of the Church to reach them was Cardi- nal Suhard of Paris. His reflection on the problem was deeply influenced by penetrating studies that had been made of it by priests. The common conclu- sion that was reached was that a whol- ly new approach was needed, a radical- ly new approach, an approach, in short, that would reach the people through the elimination of social and economic bar- riers. The approach that was planned and executed found expression in the worker-priest program. It was organ- ized on July 1, 1943 and was called the Mission de Paris.

The salient features of this evangeli- zation program are striking because of their negative as well as their positive character. The centers from which the effort would be put into operation would not be local parishes. Nor would eventual converts be taken up in- to churches in the local parishes. The priests who would engage in the new work would remain priests, to be sure, but they would also, in a sense, cease to be priests. The new movement en- visioned a program whereby the Church would literally go to and identify her- self with the unchurched. Priests would become workers, plain laborers — in factories, on docks, in mines. They would live in every respect the life of the laboring man. They would put in full days of work. They would live on their wages, they would live among the people they served — in cramped quarters and with no more amenities than their next-door neigh- bor enjoyed. The men and women who would respond to their witness would not be taken up into some church whose ways and people and clergy were foreign to them, but they would be served by the worker-priests in their own milieu as opportunity and time and place made possible. The priests would not be responsible to the local parish, but directly to the bishop under whose supervision they worked. This is the answer that Cardinal Su- hard and his co-workers gave to the problem of the indifference and hostil- ity of the masses to the Church.

The Priests and the Laboring Man

THE work that was officially or- ganized in July, 1943, was carried into execution in January, 1944. A number of priests gave up the life that is norm- ally associated with the priesthood and entered into the stream of the French laboring man's life. Each had learned a trade and went to work in some strategically located center. They worked not only in Paris but also in

The French Worker-Priests — Continued

other parts of France. They had received authority to say mass at home and to administer the sacraments whereever they judged it most profitable to do so. They were released from certain fasts and were allowed to read the mass in French with the exception of a small section. All the freedom of movement that could be extended to them was granted. A seminary was founded that trained men especially for this work. Jesuits, Franciscans, Dominicans and secular priests enrolled in the program which, until recently, counted about one hundred priests. This was an all-out effort and Roman Catholic elasticity and adaptability were stretched to the limit to make it effective.

How were these priests received by the people they sought to serve? They were received with suspicion. What was the hierarchy up to *this* time? So the priests become lonely men among the masses of men. But their loneliness was of short duration. These priests were such *peculiar* priests. In a society in which it was quite the usual thing to pilfer and filch as much as one could get away with these men left the doors of their rooms unlocked. When they heard of some hapless soul caught in a maze of bureaucratic red-tape they offered to cut through it for him. They took an interest in the housing situation. They did not hide their criticism of inequality in the economic order. They joined unions, usually the C.G.T. in which there is a great deal of outspoken Communist leadership. They even took part in strikes.

This taking part in strikes was really a crucial matter. When you take part in a strike you declare yourself *openly*. All the other things the priests had done and were doing meant identifying themselves with the *lot* of the masses. But taking part in significant strikes meant identifying themselves, in particular instances, with the *views* of the masses. And that is a different matter. But what else could the priests do? Their union decided to strike. This confronted the priests squarely with the question of the legitimacy of the strike. And this necessarily led to a consideration of the social and economic situation out of which the strike grew and with which they had associated themselves. Suppose that they had as a matter of principle refused to strike along? They would have isolated themselves from the sympathies of their people and their task would have become hopeless. So they struck when they considered a strike legitimate. Some bad mistakes were made in this connection and the priests do not deny it. When, for example, General Ridgway came to Paris to succeed General Eisenhower as head of NATO two worker-priests were arrested in a Communist inspired demonstration against his coming. This dramatic event has tended to overshadow the true effort of the priests. The press, which has a way of disregarding proportions in the interests of sensationalism, made the most of it.

All in all, it is understandable that the priests did not long remain lonely. What particularly struck those who observed them was the *spirit* in which they did all they did. It was a spirit of devotion and service and love. This was a new phenomenon in the crassly materialistic and not too honest world in which the less privileged classes have to live. Communist leaders saw them move among the very people they had thought to have within their grasp. They were rather bewildered by it. What sort of an answer could they give to this infiltration of the masses by representatives of the Church that had declared a spiritual Holy War on Communism? How does one go about criticizing people who leave their doors open to thieves and help the distressed? How can one disagree with people who agree with you when you're right?

Gradually the priests saw groups of believers and inquirers form about them. The vision that Cardinal Suhard and his associates had had began to be realized. It had become plain to the people that here a selfless sincerity was at work and they responded to it. The worker-priest program seemed to be headed for large success.

But if the sincerity of the priests became plain to the people, the radical character of their movement and its implications for the Church became plain to the hierarchy. Its meaning not only for France but for Roman Catholicism outside of France became evident. The Vatican became concerned. There were high-level conferences in France and in Rome. Was what these priests were doing compatible with the interests of the Roman Catholic Church as these interests are always carefully seen from an international and calculatingly long-range point of view?

This question brings us to the nex stage in the development of the worke priest situation. The movement tha began with idealism and hope, not un mixed with some very enthusiastic mis takes, soon found itself on the verge o disillusionment. It had to no sma extent overcome the prejudices of th men and women it had sought to gai But it found an opposition it had no looked for. This opposition came fro the Church that had sent them ou Cardinal Suhard died. Cardinal Felti became his successor. The new cardi nal did not share Suhard's interest i and sympathy for the new movement The developments that now began t take place we can best discuss in a fo lowing article. Then, too, we shall b able to draw certain parallels with ou own Home Mission and Neighborhoo Evangelization programs.

I want to close with an illustration o the problem we have touched on tha is taken from Protestant evangelism i France. I recently met a leader of th Reformed Church in France who tol me the following illuminating inciden The worker-priests have the headlines he said, but on a smaller scale we ar also tackling the question of evangeli zation in this manner. We, too, havi discovered that the masses want nothin to do with the Church. We, too, ar adapting ourselves to this situation. I one of the suburbs of Paris a Reforme minister had gathered about him group of believers much as the priest were doing. Soon there were sixt people who were interested and wer meeting regularly on Sundays in on or other home. After a bit it was n longer feasible to meet in a home be cause of the growing size of the grou So it was proposed to erect a litt chapel and hold meetings there. A ver modest wooden structure was obtaine and above it was placed a sign — Eglise Reformed (Reformed Church In this building the group met. Bu from this point on there were no mor converts. The ones who had come con tinued to come, but *this* particular e fort had lost its attractiveness for th laboring man. Why? Because it wa no longer simply a group of Christian It had become a church and the masse in France are through with the Churc

---

Note: In addition to general reading on th subject I wish to acknowledge my indebte ness to a helpful pamphlet that has recent appeared in the Netherlands, entitled "H Franse Priester-Arbeiders In Conflict M Hun Kerk," by J. Zuurdeeg.

Koene Vanden Bosch*

by J. G. VANDEN BOSCH

If anyone deserves to be included the series of biographical sketches pearing in this journal, it is the Revnd Koene Vanden Bosch. To omit n would be to show but slight regard the testimony of history. He had ch to do with the founding of a new nomination, and he was the only nister of the gospel to attend to the ritual needs of the churches compos; that denomination in its earliest rs. The fact that later his contrition to the history of these churches s not as great as that of some of his low ministers should not rob him of honor that is his due.

* * *

Koene Vanden Bosch was born bruary 19, 1818, at Wolvega, Friesd. His parents were farmers, who, en Koene was still a small boy, ved to the vicinity of Meppel. Thus birth Koene was Frisian, and by ining "Drentsch." At the age of enty-two he married Maria Rook, a d-fearing young woman, and sought make a living by digging and selling at.

When the Secession broke out in 34, the Vanden Bosch family espoused e movement. Koene, the oldest son, came deeply concerned about his iritual well-being. Outwardly he had ed a respectable Christian life, but, he himself tells us, the first twenty ars of his life he knew neither himlf nor God. Soon his eyes were ened so that he saw and bewailed his nfulness; he began to pray earnestly, find the Bible a precious book, to rsake undesirable companions, to love e fellowship of the people of God, d to feel that he had been led out of rkness into the light. However, he d not yet experience the peace of God his heart, though he knew that this uld be had only through faith in rist. For three years he agonized in is state of uncertainty, until a sermon the Reverend Hendrik De Cock, ather of the Secession, brought him arity. If this is saving faith, said e to himself, I must have had it a ng time without my knowing it.

No sooner had the peace of God lled his soul than there was born in him the desire to be a messenger of good tidings. Because he was married and had no means a bitter conflict ensued, but finally, fully determined, he disposed of his peat business and studied first with Rev. F. A. Kok, later and chiefly with Rev. W. A. Kok. The struggle to persevere till he had completed his training was a hard one. His wife did all she could to support the small growing family. He pictures himself as sometimes sitting at a table with an open book before him, one foot rocking the baby's cradle, and his hands free to do the knitting for the family. His financial situation improved somewhat when several of his fellow-students — among them R. Smit and W. H. Frieling, both later well known in America — made their home with the family as boarders. With the removal of Rev. W. A. Kok and his students to Hoogeveen poverty again stared him in the face. But the small church at Elburg in Gelderland, by asking Vanden Bosch to labor in its midst, was the source from which new help came.

There was a dearth of ministers during the early years of the Secession, and the Theological School at Kampen was not organized till 1854. To supply the need there arose a number of training schools in various parts of the country, of which those at Arnhem, Groningen, and the one in the province of Drenthe, where Vanden Bosch had his training, were the most important. The last named was conducted by Rev. W. A. Kok, once a prosperous farmer, who had no formal education except what merely as an auditor he got from attending the classes of Rev. Hendrik De Cock, which met once every fortnight. At Arnhem and Groningen the instruction was given by university graduates. But because of Rev. Kok's personality and ability to teach, the school prospered and prepared for the ministry several of the leading ministers of the Secession — J. Bavinck, L. J. Hulst, W. H. Frieling, and others. Rev. L. J. Hulst in his autobiography accords Rev. Kok high praise as a teacher. Rev. Vanden Bosch also esteemed him greatly. For forty-three years this man was pastor of the large congregation at Hoogeveen.

Finally the time came that Vanden Bosch deemed himself ready to submit to his final examination. Synod was to convene at Zwolle in the early part of 1847. But there was no unanimity among the delegates. Those from the northern provinces of Friesland, Groningen, and Drenthe had received instruction not to participate unless all delegates expressed agreement with the three Forms of Unity — the Belgic Confession, the Heidelberg Catechism, and the Canons of Dort — which historically were the standards of the Reformed faith in Holland. The delegates from the provinces of Overisel and Gelderland refused to do so. Since Vanden Bosch had accepted the call to Elburg, Gelderland, the delegates of these provinces asserted their right to examine the candidate, but courageously Vanden Bosch refused to be examined by any except those that unreservedly adopted the Forms of Unity. In this he was joined by five other candidates. When thereupon the northern delegates decided to conduct the examination but could not get the use of the church at Zwolle, they marched to a place six miles north, where they arrived at sundown, and spent the night in examining the candidates. Rev. Vanden Bosch's ministerial career had a stormy beginning.

In March, 1847, his ordination took place at Elburg. Among the poor folk composing this small congregation Rev. Vanden Bosch labored with great joy in spite of the poverty of the members that also made itself acutely felt in the minister's home. One Saturday evening there was neither food in the larder, nor money in the purse. In this extremity Rev. Vanden Bosch resorted to prayer; he had scarcely concluded when there was a man at the door with a large loaf of bread. His next charge was Het Loo, where some of his members were employed in the royal palace. His third and last charge in Holland was Noordeloos.

* * *

Ever since his student days Rev. Vanden Bosch was America-minded. He felt called of God to preach in the new world the gospel of peace. In 1848 he was eager to join his parents in their migration to America, but neither his wife nor his congregation at Elburg would give their consent.

*The subject of this sketch was a great-uncle of the author.

Koene Vanden Bosch — Continued

Finally the way was opened. A member of his church at Noordeloos who was on the point of migrating, gave him one thousand guilders to be used for defraying traveling expenses if the opportunity of going to America should ever present itself. Half a year later a group of members living in the northwest corner of the church at Zeeland, Michigan, invited him to serve them. Legally this was not a call, but Rev. Vanden Bosch regarded it as one. He eagerly accepted the invitation and soon he, together with a large part of his congregation, left old Noordeloos for new Noordeloos. After a stormy voyage of forty-eight days, the vessel that carried them to the new world dropped anchor in New York harbor. By way of Chicago and Grand Haven the company finally reached its destination. Rev. Vanden Bosch was heartily wlecomed by Dr. A. C. Van Raalte and Rev. C. Vander Meulen, and installed, in March, 1856, by the latter, the open air being the auditorium, a farmer's wagon the pulpit, and a log his seat.

What did Rev. Vanden Bosch find upon his arrival? He found among the settlers nine or ten congregations, which under the leadership of Dr. Van Raalte had decided at a hastily summoned gathering of ministers and some elders to unite with the Reformed Church of America. Reluctant to do so, they were given the promise that "they (the settlers) would be most perfectly free, at any time they found an ecclesiastical connection opposed to their religious prosperity and enjoyment, to bid us a fraternal adieu, and to be by themselves again." This union was officially consummated by the Reformed Synod in 1850. But to it there was opposition from the very beginning, an opposition that grew more determined as the settlers acquired information about the eastern church through those who came to them after having lived in the East for some time. The most important grounds for their opposition, not to speak of specific instances, were these: the three Forms of Unity were not obligatory; Free Masons were tolerated as church members; in public worship eight-hundred hymns were used instead of the psalms; proper discipline was being neglected; the receiving of material help had been a preponderant motive in favor of the union; a deposed minister was allowed to speak in their pulpits; those who had the courage to find fault with the eastern church were decried as being influenced by Satan; experience had shown that protest was futile. Some deplored the haste with which the decision had been made, there having been no time for a thorough acquaintance with the Reformed Church, nor reference of the proposed union to local consistories and congregations. Others favored an independent existence in order that the churches might live their own life as the genius of their historic Reformed faith demanded it. Of course, Dr. Van Raalte and fellow ministers staunchly defended the union. They minimized or ignored complaints, and declared the Reformed Church to be orthodox; they stressed the duty of uniting with those of like faith; and they asserted that it was no more than becoming to recognize the generosity shown by the church in the East at a time of dire need.

It is readily understood that in a brief biographical sketch such as this the arguments pro and con cannot be judicially weighed. All that can be done is to portray in a most general way the conflict in the midst of which Rev. Vanden Bosch was placed. Instructed by his classis in Holland to ascertain whether or not the Reformed Church was orthodox, that is, whether or not it made the Forms of Unity and the Church Order of Dort obligatory, Rev. Vanden Bosch naturally took note of complaints, and, remembering his stand at the time of his final examination, the reader can guess where his sympathies would lie. However, he was not in a hurry to come to a decision; he did not take decisive action until he had been in America a full year. Evidently, he saw enough truth in at least some of the charges to use them as test cases. So he brought two or three before classis, and, when he found this body unwilling to give them serious consideration, he was fully determined. On March 14, 1857, he notified classis of no longer belonging to it. Three consistories — Graafschap, Grand Rapids, Polkton — gave similar notice. Here is the beginning of the Christian Reformed denomination. Only one minister joined him, Rev. H. G. Klyn of Grand Rapids, but he returned to the fold he had left before half a year had expired.

So then separation had become a fact, and for the space of almost seven years Rev. Vanden Bosch was the only ordained minister to assume the spiritual care of four or five churches. He was kept so busy that he would preach in his own church only one out of eight or nine Sundays. Traveling in those days was beset with hazards. Rev. Vanden Bosch always had available an ax and a spade to remove or surmount obstacles in the road such as fallen trees or broken branches. Moreover the step he had taken brought him no gain. Only nineteen members of his own church remained loyal to him. Financially, too, he was a loser. But he did not mind. He preferred, as he said, the felling of trees to living with a troubled conscience.

Rev. Vanden Bosch served three churches in America: Noordeloos, 1856-1869; First Grand Haven, 1869-1878; First Chicago, 1878-1881. As the number of ministers increased, he gradually lost the place of prominence he once held. Yet he was elected president of the General Assembly in 1873 and vice-president in 1878. Bronchial trouble contracted while doing family visiting undermined his rugged frame so that he was compelled to ask for emeritation at the early age of sixty-three.

* * *

THOUGH trained for the ministry in the very early period of the Secession, he had more education than others of a later date. Rev. L. J. Hulst, for example, had only two years of study but Rev. Vanden Bosch had five. What he wrote he couched in a vigorous style which was the expression of a vigorous intellect and a strong will. Parishioners agreed in characterizing his sermons as strong and practical. But for all his good qualities, he did not achieve as much good as he might have done. He spoiled much with his touchiness, his hot temper, and his irreconcilable spirit. His pastorates were all too often marred with outbursts of storm and stress. His relation to the church at Zeeland furnishes an instance of his stubborn spirit. Since this church was originally a branch of Noordeloos, Rev. Vanden Bosch was its pastor. In course of time this group became large enough to be organized as an independent body and strong enough to call a minister. It petitioned classis for the dissolution of its connection with Noordeloos. But Rev. Vanden Bosch refused to give his consent. This conflict between him and the Zeeland group was repeatedly brought before classis. At one of its

tings in 1864 classis after due con-eration decided that, since both par- had sinned, there should be con-ion and reconciliation. But Rev. nden Bosch would not yield. Classis orted to prayer, but still he was ob-ate. The president had classis sing erse of one of the psalms, during ich singing, at last, hearts were melt-and reconciliation was effected.

The subject of our sketch was a man strong convictions. Unless such an has the ability to distinguish be-en the essential and the non-essen-, he is in danger of exalting what is ely a personal view to the eminence a basic principle. He is liable to rish too many absolutes. Rev. Van-Bosch did not escape this danger. was, for example, unalterably op-ed to fire insurance. He chided . W. H. Van Leeuwen for having in nt denied the theory that the Pope the Antichrist, and wished him to act. He insisted on a literal mastery the Compendium by those who hed to make confession of faith. en in the days of his emeritation a mon displeased him, he was sure to ke a hurried exit instead of greeting pastor with a hearty handshake as was wont to do.

* * *

If willingness to sacrifice is a tue in a minister of the gospel, Rev. nden Bosch deserves praise. Again l again he was willing to endure the onveniences of want as he did in small church at Elburg, and later Noordeloos, Michigan, where, having ly a very meager income, he was mpelled to work on his farm during ek days to provide a livelihood for family. The complaint of consis-y that he devoted too much time to farm and not enough to his church ew from him the retort that necessity mpelled him. When he declared that would rather be a woodcutter than nain in a church that was not too igent in maintaining doctrinal pur-, he meant what he said.

Contrary to what one would expect a personality such as his, Rev. Van-n Bosch had in him a strain of mysti-sm. He had not been in his first arge long when he received a call om the notoriously difficult church Het Loo. He was loath to accept. t one night the Lord spoke to him d asked what he would prefer: a urch easy to serve but without prom-e of rich results, or a church in which he would endure much hardship and worry, but also harvest many spiritual blessings. He accepted the call. Again, a severe storm overtook the vessel that carried the Vanden Bosches to America. The main mast crashed to the deck and water was already knee-deep in the hold, so that even the crew feared shipwreck. But Rev. Vanden Bosch recalled the conviction of his student days that the Lord had called him to preach the gospel in America, and he was unafraid. This flavor of mysticism reflects itself in his sermons.

Posterity should esteem Rev. Vanden Bosch for his unflinching orthodoxy. It is this characteristic of the man, together with his firmness of will, that gives him a respected place in the history of the Christian Reformed Church. Had there been in him something of the spirit of compromise, he might never have been responsible for the existence of a new denomination. He came upon the scene nine years after the first settlers arrived and seven years after the decision of the settlers to join the church in the East. This fact had its disadvantages as well as its advantages. For one thing, he did not perhaps sufficiently sympathize with the hardships and the state of mind of the earliest immigrants. On the other hand, he had the advantage of viewing the ecclesiastical scene as a newcomer who had no reputation to maintain or a course of action to justify. Perhaps he saw with greater detachment than those whose outlook was colored by personal participation in a most important historical venture. But however one wishes to interpret the motives that led Rev. Vanden Bosch to take the decisive step, one cannot but feel that loyalty to the orthodox ideal was paramount.

* * *

Shortly before his death Rev. Vanden Bosch wrote a brief account of his life in which there is to be found not the slightest intimation of regret for the momentous decision he once made. Humbly and gratefully he made mention of the blessing of God as revealed in the growth of the denomination from a very small beginning to respectable proportions. But if he regarded this growth as a token of God's favor, he found in his devotion to the Reformed heritage in which he had been nurtured the conviction that the course he had pursued had been the correct one.

It happened in the city of Grand Haven on a November day of the year 1897. Rev. Vanden Bosch was seventy-nine years old. Disease had sapped the strength of his once seemingly inexhaustible vitality. Feeling death approaching, he spoke to his children gathered at his bedside and told them that he was about to depart and to be with Jesus. He laid his hands together, calmly awaited the end, and went in peace.

Love and Discrimination

A Reply to Rev. Cornelius Holtrop

In a letter which appeared in the May issue of the *Reformed Journal*, the Rev. Cornelius Holtrop asked whether it is right to say — as I have said — that a Christian Ethics does not discriminate between believer and unbeliever. He then alludes to a few texts which he seems to feel teach that we ought to discriminate.

Since this answer is painfully but unavoidably late, I make my comments brief.

Let me state plainly that I do believe that a Christian in loving must discriminate between the objects of his love. Christian love is not blind! A Christian ought indeed to discriminate between his wife, his child, his Cadillac, and his country. It would be un-Christian to love all these *in the same manner*. Similarly, in loving the believer and the unbeliever he must keep eyes open to the difference between the believer and unbeliever, and for the same reason: to love each in a different *manner*. But it must be emphatically emphasized that a Christian may not discriminate between a believer and unbeliever, between a neighbor and brother, *in order to extend two kinds of love*, one to the former and another to the latter.

The *manner* in which love expresses itself must differ according to its object. But *whatever* a Christian loves must be loved with a *Christian* love. Any other kind of love would be non-Christian and therefore un-Christian.

There is not a shred of evidence that

Love and Discrimination — Continued

the Bible teaches Two Laws of Love: a Ten Commandment kind of neighbor-love, and a New Testament kind of brother-love. The Bible not only does not teach this but *explicitly denies it.* Our Lord put the matter as clearly as anyone could wish. After explaining the Two Tables of the Ten Commandments, Jesus said, "There is none other commandment greater than these" (Mark 12:31).

No Christian need be confused or led astray on this matter. Any argument which urges that there is another and a greater commandment than the Ten Commandments is a contradiction of the plain teaching of our Lord.

And does not James call the law of neighbor-love the royal law of love? "If ye fulfil the royal law, according to the scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well" (James 2:8).

Furthermore, the New Testament is full of warnings and instructions which would teach us that a discrimination between men for the purpose of dispensing different ethical attitudes of love is, on the one hand, the very essence of Pharisaical Ethics, and on the other, a subtle way of justifying our sinful refusal to love as we ought.

Rev. Holtrop alludes to Gal. 6:10 "So then, as we have opportunity, let us work that which is good toward all men, and especially toward them that are of the household of faith." The "as we have opportunity," the "all men," and the "especially" clearly show that Paul had distinctions of de*grees* not of *kinds* of love in mind. If what the Christian must do to fellow Christians, he must also do to all men, then he is not under requirement to do two things that differ in kind! Paul's conception of the Ten Commandments quite agrees with that of Jesus: "There is none other commandment greater than these."

As to Peter's words: "Love the brotherhood" (I Peter 2:17) — Does this command imply that we ought to love only the brotherhood? Or that we ought to have a special kind of love reserved for the brotherhood alone? Obviously not. Jesus said, "Love you enemies," and he used the same word that Peter uses here: *agape.* Agape for the brotherhood and agape for the enemy is and remains agape — even when we for private reasons think that agape is much too good for the enemy and unbeliever!

But this I think is quite sufficient to show that we have neither the need or the right to fashion a second law of love demanding a second kind of love.

Our interpretations of particular biblical expressions about love must be done in the clear light of our Lord's clear statement about the Ten Commandments. The argument that there is another and greater law of love is in flat contradiction to our Lord's appraisal of the Ten Commandments: "There is none other commandment greater than these."

If there is but one royal law of love then we have neither the need nor the right to discriminate between men in order to extend two kinds of love. All such discrimination is an evasion of the biblical law of love.

JAMES DAANE

Now Ready!

This absorbing biography of the founder of the modern Evangelical movement, which is in effect a history of the 20th-century Evangelical struggle.

J. GRESHAM MACHEN

A Biographical Memoir By Ned B. Stonehouse

520 PAGES, ILLUSTRATED. PRICE $5.95

J. GRESHAM MACHEN

Special to* REFORMED JOURNAL *Readers:

Yours for only $4.00 postpaid. Save $1.95.

Use convenient coupon below.

This perceptive and illuminating biography of J. Gresham Machen by his intimate friend, associate and successor, Ned B. Stonehouse, is the definitive life of as learned and valiant a spiritual warrior as the Protestant church has produced in modern times. Based upon a wealth of correspondence, memoranda and other documents in addition to the author's personal reminiscences, and an evaluation of Machen's published writings, this biography has taken nearly ten years to complete. It is a vivid and absorbing picture of the full, colorful, brilliant life of the man who has counted most for the intellectual as well as spiritual vigor of historic Protestantism in this century.

A life-size portrait, Stonehouse's account tells the whole Machen story, from childhood to his untimely death in 1937 when he was called "the first Protestant minister in the nation." Stonehouse also tells the fascinating history of the 20th century evangelical struggle: the debates of the twenties and thirties, the heyday of liberalism, the historic reorganization at Princeton, and the founding of Westminster. Here, too, are intimate glimpses into the personalities who made this absorbing and eventful history.

"Machen was the greatest theologian in the English speaking world, and the greatest leader of the whole cause of evangelical Christianity." —PROFESSOR CASPER WISTAR HODGE

"One of Machen's unique abilities was to preach the Biblical Gospel, exactly as it is set forth in the beloved Word, and at the same time make an application of it to modern circumstances which is utterly refreshing because both new and supremely appropriate." —PAUL WOOLLEY in *The Presbyterian Guardian.*

Order Form

REFORMED JOURNAL
READING CLUB
255 Jefferson, Grand Rapids, Mich.

Please send me ..... copy (ies) of J. GRESHAM MACHEN, by Ned B. Stonehouse at *Special Price* of $4.00

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY ..... Zone .... STATE .....

I enclose $.....